

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Office Action mailed August 3, 2006 (hereinafter referred to as "the Office Action"). Claim 32 is cancelled, Claims 14-16, 22, 24-26, and 34 are amended, and no new claims are added. Claims 2-3, 5-7, 9, 14-16, 18, 21-30 and 33-34 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicant requests that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. Claim Objections

The Office Action objected to Claim 22 because it depended on cancelled Claim 19. As noted above, Applicant has amended Claim 22 to depend from allowed independent Claim 21. Accordingly, this objection should be withdrawn.

II. Allowed Subject Matter

The Examiner's allowance of Claims 21, 23, 28-30, and 33 is appreciated. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful review and allowance of those claims.

The Applicant submits the following comments concerning the Examiner's statements of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter in the Office Action. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the claimed invention of Claims 21, 23, 28-30, and 33 is patentable over the prior art, but respectfully disagrees with the Examiners statement of reasons for allowance as set forth in Office Action. Applicant submits that it is the claim as a whole, rather than any particular limitation, that makes each of the claims allowable. No single limitation should be construed as the reason for allowance of a claim because it is each of the elements of the claim that makes it allowable. Therefore, Applicant does not concede that the reasons for allowable subject matter given by the Examiner are the only reasons that make, or would make, the claims

allowable and do not make any admission or concession concerning the Examiner's statement in the Office Action.

The Examiner has indicated that Claims 14 and 26 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant has rewritten independent Claim 24 so as to include all of the limitations of former Claim 26. In particular, the scope of newly amended independent Claim 24 (i.e., the scope of former Claim 26) has not been narrowed in any way so as to overcome any prior art, but has merely been rewritten in an independent format. As acknowledged by the Examiner, that claim is patentably distinct from the prior art, and is now in a condition for allowance. Moreover, for at least the same reason, claims now depending from newly amended independent Claim 24 – namely, newly amended Claim 26 and Claim 27 – are also in a condition for allowance.

Similarly, Applicant has rewritten independent Claim 34 so as to include all of the limitations of former Claim 14. In particular, the scope of newly amended independent Claim 34 (i.e., the scope of former Claim 14) has not been narrowed in any way so as to overcome any prior art, but has merely been rewritten in an independent format. As acknowledged by the Examiner, that claim is patentably distinct from the prior art, and is now in a condition for allowance. Moreover, for at least the same reason, claims now depending from newly amended independent Claim 34 – namely, Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 15, 16, and 18– are also in a condition for allowance.

In summary, Claims 24, and 34 are now pending in view of the above amendments, and all are patentably distinct from the prior art. Allowance of each of these claims is respectfully requested.

III. Prior Art Rejections

Claims 2-3, 5-7, 15-16, 18, 22, 24, 27, 32, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication Number 2006/0039432 to Ha et al. As an initial matter, Applicant notes that Claim 32 has been cancelled. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

In addition, as noted in section II above, independent Claims 24 and 34 are now in a condition of allowance and thus the rejection to these claims and the claims that depend from them should also be withdrawn.

Claims 14 and 25 have been amended to depend from allowed independent Claim 28 and are thus allowable for the reasons that independent Claim 28 is allowable. Accordingly this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes the claims as amended or presently pending are in allowable form and that every issue raised by the Office Action has been addressed. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorneys.

Dated this 21st day of December, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



ERIC L. MASCHOFF
Registration No. 36,596
SHANE K. JENSEN
Registration No. 55,301
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 022913
Telephone: (801) 533-9800

W:\15436\436.3\ML0000004433V001.doc